

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:	§	Attorney Docket No. 9226
Pricer, et al.	§	
	§	Customer No. 26890
Serial No. 09/752,355	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: 2153
Filed: December 29, 2000	§	
	§	Examiner: Strange, Aaron N.
For: IDENTIFYING WEB-LOG DATA	§	
REPRESENTING A SINGLE USER	§	Confirmation Number: 8429
SESSION	§	

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

This Brief is submitted in connection with an appeal for which a Notice of Appeal was filed 1 December 2008, from the final rejection of the Examiner dated 29 August 2008 finally rejecting claims 1-24.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency fees in association with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-4370.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Teradata Corporation, a corporation having a principal place of business at 2835 Miami Village Drive, Miamisburg, OH 45342, the United States of America.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals and no related interferences regarding the above-identified patent application.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-24 are pending, and stand finally rejected. Claims 1-24 are on appeal here and are set forth in the Claims Appendix attached hereto.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were made to any of claims after the Final Office Action was filed 29 August 2008.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

An embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 1, relates to a method for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the method comprising loading data from a plurality of transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers into a database system managed by plural parallel processing modules (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N; Figure 3, element 300), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 22-23; Page 4, Line 40-Page 5, Line 3; Figure 3, elements 305 and 310), and executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user (Page 1, Lines 23-25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

Another embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 6, relates to a computer program, stored on a tangible storage medium, for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the program comprising executable instructions that cause one or more computers to (Page 6, Line 47-Page 7, Line 12) load data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers into a database system managed by plural parallel processing modules (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N; Figure 3, element 300), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 22-23; Page 4, Line 40-Page 5, Line 3; Figure 3, elements 305 and 310), and execute a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user (Page 1, Lines 23-25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

Another embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 11, relates to a database system comprising a plurality of data-storage facilities that store data received from

transaction logs of a plurality of Internet server computers (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 3, Lines 17-20; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 210₁-210_N; Figure 3, element 300), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server computers, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 22-23; Page 4, Line 40-Page 5, Line 3; Figure 3, elements 305 and 310), plural parallel processing modules that manage the data stored in the data-storage facilities (Page 3, Lines 12-15; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N), and a database-management component that executes a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user (Page 1, Lines 23-25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

Another embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 22, relates to a method for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the method comprising loading data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers across plural parallel processing modules of a database system (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N; Figure 3, element 300), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 22-23; Page 4, Line 40-Page 5, Line 3; Figure 3, elements 305 and 310), extracting from the loaded data the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 3; Page 5, Lines 21-22; Figure 3, element 315), storing the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 2), and executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using an MDIFF extension to SQL as a function to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user (Page 1, Lines 23-

25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

Another embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 23, relates to a computer program, stored on a tangible storage medium, for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the program comprising executable instructions that cause one or more computers to (Page 6, Line 47-Page 7, Line 12) load data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers across plural parallel processing modules of a database system (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N; Figure 3), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 22-23; Page 4, Line 40-Page 5, Line 3; Figure 3, elements 305 and 310), extract from the loaded data the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 3; Page 5, Lines 21-22; Figure 3, element 315), store the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 2), and execute a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user (Page 1, Lines 23-25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

Another embodiment, as set forth in independent claim 24, relates to a database system comprising a plurality of data-storage facilities that store data received from a plurality of transaction logs of a plurality of Internet server computers (Page 3, Lines 17-20; Figure 2, elements 210₁-210_N), where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server computers, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 1, Lines 20-21; Page 3, Lines 7-16; Page 4, Lines 7-10; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N; Figure 3), plural parallel processing modules that (Page 3, Lines 12-15; Figure 2, elements 205₁-205_N) extract from the stored data the information identifying which user

submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 3; Page 5, Lines 21-22; Figure 3, element 315), and store the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was receive (Page 4, Line 37-Page 5, Line 2), and a database-management component that executes a database query across the parallel processing modules using an MDIFF extension to SQL to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that use (Page 1, Lines 23-25; Page 4, Lines 3-6; Page 5, Lines 21-29; Page 6, Lines 42-44; Figure 3, elements 315 and 320).

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

I. The specification was objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

II. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0042821 to Muret, et al. ("Muret") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,394 to Tsuchida, et al. ("Tsuchida"), and further in view of WO 00/20998 to Miller, et al. ("Miller").

ARGUMENT

I. Objection to the Specification

The first issue for the Board's consideration is whether the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Particularly, the Examiner has objected to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claim term “tangible storage medium” appearing in claims 6 and 23.

As detailed below, the Appellants believe the specification provides disclosure of the claimed “tangible storage medium.”

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term “tangible storage medium” appearing in claims 6 and 23.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP 2163.07(a) (in part):

2163.07(a) Inherent Function, Theory, or Advantage

By disclosing in a patent application a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a theory or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it.

Further, as the PTO recognizes in MPEP 2111.01 (in part)

THE WORDS OF A CLAIM MUST BE GIVEN THEIR “PLAIN MEANING” UNLESS SUCH MEANING IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SPECIFICATION

Although claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.). This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (discussed below); Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc., 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004)

Further, with regard to the term “tangible”, the following definitions are provided:

1 a: capable of being perceived especially by the sense of touch :
PALPABLE b: substantially real : **MATERIAL**
Merriam-Webster Online (www.m-w.com)

adj. perceptible by touch; real or concrete

The New International Webster's Pocket Dictionary of the English Language, Trident Press International, 2002.

The subject application recites the following:

[V]arious implementations of the invention are realized in electronic hardware, computer software, or combinations of these technologies...implementations include one or more computer programs executed by a programmable computer. In general, the computer includes one or more processors, one or more **data-storage components** (e.g., **volatile and nonvolatile memory modules and persistent optical and magnetic storage devices**, such as hard and **floppy disk drives, CD-ROM drives, and magnetic tape drives**)... The computer programs include executable code that is usually **stored in a persistent storage medium** and then copied into memory at run-time. The processor executes the code by retrieving program instructions from memory in a prescribed order...

Subject application, Pages 6-7 (**Emphasis Added**).

Thus, the application disclosure clearly recites computer programs or software stored on storage components, such as volatile and nonvolatile memory, optical and magnetic storage devices, such as floppy disk drives, CD-ROM drives, and magnetic tape drives, or other persistent storage mediums - **each of which is inherently a tangible storage medium**. Accordingly, the subject application specification necessarily discloses a tangible storage medium according to the plain meaning of the word "tangible," and withdrawal of the objection to the specification is thus requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Muret in view of Tsuchida and Further in View of Miller

The second issue for the Board's consideration is whether claims 1-24 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Muret in view of Tsuchida and further in view of Miller.

For purposes of this appeal, claims 2-24 stand or fall together with claim 1 in view of Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller.

As detailed below, the Appellants believe that Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller are insufficient to obviate claims 1-24. More specifically, it is Appellants' belief that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 1.

Claims 1-24

The Appellant traverses the rejection of these claims on the grounds that Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 recites the following:

1. A method for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the method comprising:
loading data from a plurality of transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers into a database system managed by plural parallel processing modules, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received; and
executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP § 2142:

... The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness...

It is submitted that, in the present case, the Examiner has not factually supported a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the following reasons:

Even When Combined, the References Do Not Teach the Claimed Subject Matter

The Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller references cannot be applied to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 which provides that:

A patent may not be obtained ... if the differences between

the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains ... (Emphasis added)

Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated. However, since none of Muret, Tsuchida, or Miller teaches “executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user” as is claimed in claim 1, it is impossible to render the subject matter of claim 1 as a whole obvious, and the explicit terms of the statute cannot be met.

With regard to the claim 1 limitation of “executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user,” the Examiner has conceded that Muret fails to disclose such a method step (See Final Office Action dated 29 August 2008, Page 5) and alleges that Miller discloses such a mechanism. Applicants respectfully disagree. With regard to a moving difference database management function, Miller recites the following:

MDIFF Results Table This table supports the MDIFF function that takes as parameters a table name, one or more value expressions, widths and corresponding sort expression lists, the result column, and the key column for the result set, to derive a new column for each value expression giving the moving difference of the value expression when the rows are sorted by the sort expression list. The moving difference is calculated as the difference between the current value and the Nth previous value, where N equals the width. The moving difference is NULL if there is no Nth preceding row in the table or group.

Miller, Page 25, Lines 26-34.

Here, Miller simply describes a moving difference function for calculating a moving difference of an expression when rows are sorted by a sort expression list. Miller in no manner describes, suggest, or otherwise alludes to executing a database query using a moving difference database management function **to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.**

Because Muret and Tsuchida are wholly silent with regard to any use of a moving

difference database management function, Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller are necessarily deficient from obviating the subject claim limitation of executing a database query across the parallel processing modules *using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user* because none of the references describe or suggest the use of a moving difference database management function for identification of entries associated with a single session of a particular user. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Further, with regard to the claim 1 limitation of “executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user,” the Examiner stated the following:

Applicant’s arguments attack the cited references individually and fail to consider the combined teachings of the references. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.... While Applicant asserts that “the Examiner has conceded that Muret fails to disclose” the above quoted limitation, the Office action of 2/13/08 clearly stated that the combination of Muret and Tsuchida taught executing a database query across the parallel processing modules to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of the user...

Final Office Action dated 29 August 2008, Pages 2-3.

The Appellants respectfully disagree. The Appellants are not attacking the cited references individually or failing to consider the combined teachings of the references. Rather, the Appellants have simply noted that Muret does not describe or suggest executing a database query across the parallel processing modules **“using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.”** Further, Appellants note that Muret does not in any manner describe selection of entries “corresponding to a single session of that user” but is, instead, silent with regard to selection of data of a single session of a user. Further, as conceded by the Examiner, Muret does not in any manner describe or suggest **“using a moving difference database management function”** for selection of entries of a particular session as clearly recited in claim 1, and Miller only refers to a moving difference function for calculating a

moving difference of an expression. Thus, neither Muret or Miller describes “executing a database query across the parallel processing modules **using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.**” Tsuchida provides for none of the deficiencies of Muret and Miller. Thus, none of the cited references describe, suggest, or allude to “executing a database query” “using a moving difference database management function to select...all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.” For at least this reason, the Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller references fail to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 1.

Independent claims 6, 11, 22, 23 and 24 recite similar features as claim 1 and were rejected under similar rationale. Therefore, the same distinctions between Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for claims 6, 11, 22, 23, and 24. For at least the reasons described above, the Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller references fail to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 6, 11, 22, 23 and 24, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6, 11, 22, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-21 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, the same distinctions between Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-21. For at least this reason, Muret, Tsuchida, and Miller are insufficient to obviate claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-21.

III. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-24 be allowed. A prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve McDonald', with a large circular flourish at the end.

Steven T. McDonald
Registration No. 45,999

Dated: 1 May 2009

Teradata Corporation
2722 Creek Crossing Drive
McKinney, Texas 75070
Telephone: 214.566.9362
Docket No.: 9226

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the method comprising:

loading data from a plurality of transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers into a database system managed by plural parallel processing modules, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

2. The method of claim 1, where the step of selecting includes selecting entries with time stamps lying in a predetermined range.

3. The method of claim 1, where the step of selecting includes comparing time stamps of entries and selecting each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than a predetermined amount.

4. The method of claim 3, where the step of selecting includes selecting each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than 30 minutes.

5. The method of claim 1, also including sorting the selected entries chronologically to reconstruct the user's clickstream.

6. A computer program, stored on a tangible storage medium, for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the program comprising executable instructions that cause one or more computers to:

load data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers into a database system managed by plural parallel processing modules, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

execute a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

7. The program of claim 6, where, in selecting entries, the computer selects entries with time stamps lying in a predetermined range.

8. The program of claim 6, where, in selecting entries, the computer compares time stamps of entries and selects each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than a predetermined amount.

9. The program of claim 8, where, in selecting entries, the computer selects each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than 30 minutes.

10. The program of claim 6, where the computer also sorts the selected entries chronologically to reconstruct the user's clickstream.

11. A database system comprising:

- a plurality of data-storage facilities that store data received from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet server computers, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server computers, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received;
- plural parallel processing modules that manage the data stored in the data-storage facilities; and
- a database-management component that executes a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the data all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

12. The system of claim 11, where the database-management component is selects entries with time stamps lying in a predetermined range.

13. The system of claim 11, where the database-management component compares time stamps of entries and selects each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than a predetermined amount.

14. The system of claim 13, where the database-management component selects each entry for which the time stamp differs from the time stamp of another entry by less than 30 minutes.

15. The system of claim 11, where the database-management component sorts the selected entries chronologically to reconstruct the user's clickstream.

16. The method of claim 1, further comprising processing the data loaded into the single database table to extract from each entry in the single database table the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received.

17. The method of claim 16, further comprising storing the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying

which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received.

18. The method of claim 1, where loading data into a single database table includes loading data into a table having a single column, where the single column includes a row for each entry in the one or more transaction logs of the one or more Internet servers.

19. The program of claim 6, where the one or more computers also process the data loaded into the single database table to extract from each entry in the single database table the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received.

20. The program of claim 19, where the one or more computers also store the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received.

21. The program of claim 6, where the one or more computers also, in loading data into a single database table, load data into a table having a single column, where the single column includes a row for each entry in the one or more transaction logs of the one or more Internet servers.

22. A method for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the method comprising:

loading data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers across plural parallel processing modules of a database system, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received;

extracting from the loaded data the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received;

storing the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

executing a database query across the parallel processing modules using an MDIFF extension to SQL as a function to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

23. A computer program, stored on a tangible storage medium, for use in tracking the actions of an Internet user, the program comprising executable instructions that cause one or more computers to:

load data from transaction logs of a plurality of Internet servers across plural parallel processing modules of a database system, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server, including information identifying which user

submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received;

extract from the loaded data the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received;

store the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

execute a database query across the parallel processing modules using a moving difference database management function to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that user.

24. A database system comprising:

a plurality of data-storage facilities that store data received from a plurality of transaction logs of a plurality of Internet server computers, where the data includes an entry for each request to the Internet server computers, including information identifying which user submitted the request and information identifying the time at which the request was received;

plural parallel processing modules that:

extract from the stored data the information identifying which user submitted the request and the information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

store the extracted information in a database table having plural columns, one for the information identifying which user submitted the

request, and another for the information identifying the time at which the request was received; and

a database-management component that executes a database query across the parallel processing modules using an MDIFF extension to SQL to select from the database table all entries associated with a particular user and corresponding to a single session of that use.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.